

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Independent claims 1 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breed (U.S. Pat. No. 6,175,787 B1) in view of Doyle (U.S. Pat. No. 5,850,188). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Breed discloses a system having a plurality of sensors which feed into a trainable neural network controller. The controller predicts vehicle component or system failures and indicates the situation to the vehicle driver.

Doyle discloses an RKE transmitter which transmits diagnostic data regarding the functionality of the transmitter. The diagnostic data is received by a vehicle-mounted receiver and stored therein. The diagnostic data may subsequently be retrieved from the receiver via a typical electrical diagnostic test port.

In light of Breed and Doyle, applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to clarify the relationship between applicant's sensor signal and diagnostic signal. Independent claims 1 and 11 now require that the generated diagnostic signal is modulated only by the sensor signal, and that the transmitter portion transmits the diagnostic signal over radio waves. Applicant respectfully avers that Breed and Doyle, either alone or in combination, do not provide such a relationship between the elements. In contradistinction, both Breed and Doyle have controllers which generate diagnostic signals in response to sensor signals; however the diagnostic signals are not modulated by the sensor signals. Instead, Breed and Doyle use an intermediate controller to modulate the diagnostic signals in accordance with a neural network

output (Breed, Fig. 4)) or status register flags which are set according to a diagnostic polling routine (Doyle, col. 4, lines 35-46).

For these reasons applicant respectfully avers that independent claims 1 and 11 are now in a condition for allowance. Claims 2-10, and 12-18 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 11 and are therefore also believed to be in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 944-6526.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/13/04

By: 

Edwin W. Bacon, Jr.
Reg. No. 39,098
248-944-6526

DAIMLERCHRYSLER INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL COMPANY
CIMS 483-02-19
800 Chrysler Drive
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326